arXiv:1303.6624v1 [math-ph] 26 Mar 2013

STOCHASTIC ISOMETRIES IN QUANTUM MECHANICS

P. BUSCH
FORMER AFFILIATION: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HULL, UK
CURRENT: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF YORK, UK
E-MAIL ADDRESS: `PAUL.BUSCH@YORK.AC.UK`

PUBLISHED IN: *MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS, ANALYSIS AND GEOMETRY* **2** (1999) 83-106.
DOI: 10.1023/A:1009822315406

Abstract. The class of stochastic maps, that is, linear, trace-preserving, positive maps between the self-adjoint trace class operators of complex separable Hilbert spaces plays an important role in the representation of reversible dynamics and symmetry transformations. Here a characterization of the isometric stochastic maps is given and possible physical applications are indicated.

1. Introduction

The mathematical modeling of a quantum dynamical system is based on the dual concepts of states and observables. Of particular importance for the representation of dynamics and symmetries are structure-preserving bijective maps of the sets of states and observables, respectively. Such maps, referred to as affine automorphisms of states and Jordan automorphisms of observables, respectively, have been quite thoroughly studied in the Hilbert space model ([1], for a recent systematic account, see [4]) and in the C^*-algebraic formulation of quantum theory [7]. These automorphisms are special instances of the larger classes of linear isometries acting on the state space and the algebra of observables, respectively, which are of interest in their own right. While isometries of operator algebras were analyzed by Kadison in 1951 [8], applications of isometric transformations of states have been considered only in recent years. The characterization of the class of isometric state transformations in the Hilbert space model of quantum mechanics is the subject of the present paper.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the notion of a linear state transformation – also called *stochastic map* – in the Hilbert space model of quantum mechanics is presented and some of its basic properties are

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 47D45; Secondary: 47D20; 81Q99; 81R99.

Key words and phrases. Hilbert space, trace class, state operator stochastic map, isometry, quantum mechanics, reversibility.

The author wishes to thank Pekka Lahti for helpful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript.

reviewed. An isometric map among the stochastic maps is distinguished by a feature that turns out to be fundamental for the subsequent considerations: it sends orthogonal pairs of states to orthogonal pairs (Proposition 2.1). In Section 3 the main result (Theorem 1) concerning isometric stochastic maps is stated: any stochastic isometry decomposes into a convex combination of pure stochastic isometries onto mutually orthogonal ranges. In the case of a completely positive stochastic isometry, all these pure isometries are induced by unitary maps (Theorem 2). The decomposition of stochastic isometries involves two steps (Propositions 3.3 and 3.4), proofs of which are carried out in Sections 4 and 5. In the first step one is led to introduce the concept of *mixing* isometries (Definition 2), while the second step consists of an analysis of the structure of mixing isometries.

Section 6 concludes with some general observations and an outline of physical applications. First, a stochastic isometry is shown to allow an interpretation as a model of a reversible state transformation even when surjectivity is not given (Theorem 3). An isometric state transformation leads to a reduction of the state space so that some observables and symmetries can no longer be distinguished. This may be taken as a reversible model of structure formation. Finally, a stochastic isometry can be used in conjunction with a certain transformation of observables to produce equivalent descriptions of the same physical system; these occur naturally in the construction of extended models accounting for new experiences with the given system.

2. Stochastic Maps

Let $\mathcal{H}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ be complex separable Hilbert spaces with inner products $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$, taken to be linear in the second argument and conjugate linear in the first. Let $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be the complex Banach space of linear operators of trace class on $\mathcal{H}$, with trace functional $\mathrm{tr}[\cdot]$ and trace norm $||\cdot||_1$. Its dual space can be identified with the Banach space $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The self-adjoint parts of $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $V := \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s$ and $W := \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_s$, are real Banach spaces. By V^+ we denote the set of positive linear operators in V, the convex positive cone of V. With reference to the quantum physical application, V is called *state space*, the elements of the subset $\mathcal{S} := V^+ \cap \{\rho \in V : \mathrm{tr}[\rho] = 1\}$ are called *states*. The set $\mathcal{S}$ is convex, its extreme points are given by the orthogonal projections of rank 1. These are called *pure states* and denoted P_φ, $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$, $\varphi \neq 0$. For $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, we denote the corresponding entities as $\tilde{V}$, $\tilde{W}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, etc. A linear map $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ is called a *stochastic map* (on V) if it is *positive* $[T(V^+) \subset \tilde{V}^+]$ and *trace preserving* $[\mathrm{tr} \circ T = \mathrm{tr}]$, or equivalently, if it sends states to states $[T(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{S}}]$. A stochastic map that is isometric $[||T(\rho)||_1 = ||\rho||_1,\ \rho \in V]$ will be called *stochastic isometry*.

The term operator will be used throughout to denote a linear operator. By 0 and I (or $I_{\mathcal{H}}$) we will denote the zero and identity operators, respectively.

According to the spectral theorem, any self-adjoint operator a admits a decomposition into positive and negative parts, denoted $a = a_+ - a_-$, where the ranges of a_+, a_- are mutually orthogonal subspaces. For a bounded operator a we define $|a| := (a^*a)^{1/2}$. If a is self-adjoint, one has $|a| = a_+ + a_-$. For $\rho \in V$ we have $\|\rho\|_1 = \mathrm{tr}\big[\rho_+\big] + \mathrm{tr}\big[\rho_-\big] = \|\rho_+ + \rho_-\|_1$, and so

$$\rho \in V^+ \iff \|\rho\|_1 = \mathrm{tr}[\rho]. \tag{2.1}$$

We recall some basic facts about stochastic maps and stochastic isometries. A linear map $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ is called *contractive* [or a *contraction*], if for all $\rho \in V$, $\|T(\rho)\|_1 \leq \|\rho\|_1$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ be a linear map. The following are equivalent:*
(i) T is trace preserving and positive (i.e. a stochastic map);
(ii) T is trace preserving and contractive;
(iii) $T(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$.

The proof is a straightforward application of Eq. (2.1).

Definition 1. *Positive elements $\rho, \sigma \in V^+ \backslash \{0\}$ are called orthogonal, $\rho \perp \sigma$, if $\rho \cdot \sigma = 0$. A stochastic map $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ is said to be orthogonality preserving if $\rho \perp \sigma$ implies $T(\rho) \perp T(\sigma)$ for all $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ [and thus for all $\rho, \sigma \in V^+ \backslash \{0\}$].*

By the spectral theorem, $\rho \perp \sigma$ exactly when ρ and σ are the positive and negative parts of $\rho - \sigma$, respectively. Hence we have:

$$\rho \perp \sigma \iff \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = \|\rho + \sigma\|_1, \quad \rho, \sigma \in V^+ \backslash \{0\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Proposition 2.1. *Let $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ be a stochastic map. The following are equivalent:*
(i) T is an isometry;
(ii) T is orthogonality preserving;
(iii) T is orthogonality preserving for pairs of pure states.

The proof is a straightforward application of Eq. (2.2).

3. Stochastic Isometries

In this section the main results concerning stochastic isometries will be stated. The proofs will be developed in Sections 4 and 5.

A stochastic map is called *pure* if it sends pure states to pure states. An isometric linear or antilinear map $U : \mathcal{H} \to \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ will be called *unitary* or *antiunitary*, respectively. We first present the known case of surjective stochastic isometries.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ be a surjective stochastic isometry. Then T is of the form*

$$T(\rho) \; = \; U \rho U^*, \quad \rho \in V, \tag{3.1}$$

where $U : \mathcal{H} \to \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is unitary or antiunitary.

Proof. Noting that the inverse of a surjective stochastic isometry T is a trace preserving isometric map on V and hence, by Lemma 2.1, a stochastic isometry, it is easy to verify that T is pure. By Theorem 2.3.1 of [5] it follows that T is of the form $T(\rho) = U\rho U^*$, $\rho \in V$, where U is linear or antilinear. Furthermore, $U^*U = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ since T is trace-preserving, and $UU^* = I_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}$ by surjectivity of T. Hence U is unitary or antiunitary. □

If $\mathcal{H} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is finite dimensional then any stochastic isometry $T : V \to V$ is surjective, hence pure and of the form (3.1).

An affine automorphism of the convex set of states $\mathcal{S}$ is a bijective affine map of $\mathcal{S}$ onto itself. Such maps are taken to represent symmetries on the set of states. Any affine map on $\mathcal{S}$ has a unique extension to a linear map on V, which is a stochastic map. An affine automorphism of $\mathcal{S}$ extends to a surjective stochastic isometry. Thus it is seen that in the case $\mathcal{H} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, Proposition 3.1 reproduces the Wigner-Kadison characterization of symmetries [1],[7],[4].

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $\mathcal{H}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ *be complex separable Hilbert spaces such that* $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ *can be presented as a direct sum of mutually orthogonal closed subspaces,* $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \left(\oplus_{k=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k\right) \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$, $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, *with* $\mathrm{dim}\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k = \mathrm{dim}\mathcal{H}$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots, N$. *Let* $U_k : \mathcal{H} \to \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k$ *be unitary or antiunitary maps,* $w_1, w_2, \cdots \in (0, 1)$, $\sum_k w_k = 1$. *Then*

$$T(\rho) = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k U_k \rho U_k^*, \quad \rho \in V, \tag{3.2}$$

defines a stochastic isometry $T : V \to \tilde{V}$. *In the case* $N = \infty$, *the sum converges in trace norm.*

Proof. The trace is a normal map and so $\mathrm{tr}\big[T(\rho)\big] = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \mathrm{tr}\big[U_k^* U_k \rho\big] = \mathrm{tr}\big[\rho\big]$ for $\rho \in V$, the last equality being due to $U_k^* U_k = I$. Hence T is trace preserving. T is positive since $U_k \rho U_k^* \in V^+$ for $\rho \in V^+$. All $T_k : \rho \mapsto U_k \rho U_k^*$ are isometric, and for $\rho \in V$, $|T_k(\rho)| \perp |T_\ell(\rho)|$ if $k \neq \ell$. Thus, $|T(\rho)| = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k |T_k(\rho)|$, and

$$\|T(\rho)\|_1 = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \|T_k(\rho)\|_1 = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k \|\rho\|_1 = \|\rho\|_1 .$$

Convergence in trace norm follows from $\big\|\sum_{k=n}^{n+m} w_k U_k \rho U_k^*\big\|_1 \leq \sum_{k=n}^{n+m} w_k \|\rho\|_1$ and the fact that $\tilde{V}$ is complete. □

The construction of Proposition 3.2 turns out to be generic.

Theorem 1. *Let* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *be a stochastic isometry. Then* $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ *can be decomposed as* $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \left(\oplus_{k=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k\right) \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$, *with dim(*$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k$*)=dim(*$\mathcal{H}$*),* $k = 1, 2, \cdots, N \leq \infty$. *There exist weights* $w_k > 0$, $\sum_{k=1}^N w_k = 1$, *and unitary or antiunitary maps* $U_k : \mathcal{H} \to \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k$ *such that* T *is of the form of Eq. (3.2).*

Theorem 1 is an immediate consequence of Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 to be formulated next. A concept central to the decomposition of stochastic isometries is the following.

Definition 2. *A stochastic map* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *will be called (m)-mixing* ($m \in \mathbb{N}$) *if every pure state* P_φ, $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$, *is sent to an m-fold degenerate mixture; that is:* $T(P_\varphi) = \frac{1}{m}\Pi_\varphi$, *where* Π_φ *is an orthogonal projection of rank* m.

Proposition 3.3. *A stochastic isometry* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *can be decomposed into a* (σ-)*convex combination of mixing stochastic isometries with mutually orthogonal ranges. That is, there is a family of mixing stochastic isometries* $T_\nu : V \to \tilde{V}$, $\nu = 1, 2, \cdots, N \le \infty$ *and a strictly decreasing sequence of weights* $w_1 > w_2 > \cdots$, $\sum_{\nu=1}^N w_\nu = 1$, *such that*

$$T(\rho) \;=\; \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} w_\nu T_\nu(\rho), \qquad \rho \in V. \tag{3.3}$$

The sum converges in trace norm when $N = \infty$. *The ranges of the* T_ν *can be represented as subspaces of* $\mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\nu)_s$, *where the* $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\nu$ *are mutually orthogonal closed subspaces of* $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proposition 3.4. *Any m-mixing stochastic isometry* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *is of the form given in Equation 3.2, with* $N = m$, $w_k = \frac{1}{m}$.

A positive map $T : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s \to \mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})_s$ is called *completely positive* if its canonical extension $T^{(n)} : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s \otimes \mathcal{B}_1(\mathbb{C}^n)_s \to \mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})_s \otimes \mathcal{B}_1(\mathbb{C}^n)_s$ is positive for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As a specification of Theorem 1 the following characterization of completely positive stochastic isometries will be obtained.

Theorem 2. *A completely positive stochastic isometry* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *is of the form of Equation (3.2), with all* U_k *unitary,* $k = 1, 2, \cdots, N$.

4. Decompositions of Stochastic Isometries

For $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$, $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we will interchangeably use the notations $\langle \rho\,,\, a\rangle$ and $\langle a\,,\, \rho\rangle$ for $\mathrm{tr}\big[\rho{\cdot}a\big]$. The dual $T^* : \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})_s \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_s$ of a positive linear map $T : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s \to \mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})_s$ is a normal positive linear map ([5], Lemma 2.2.2), and any normal positive linear map on $\mathcal{B}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})_s$ is the dual of a positive linear map on $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s$. $T^*(I) = I$ is equivalent to T being trace-preserving. Maps T on $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s$ and their dual maps T^* will henceforth be understood to be linear without explicit mention.

Definition 3. *The support (projection) of a state* $\rho \in \mathcal{S}$, *denoted* $\Pi(\rho)$, *is the smallest orthogonal projection* P *such that* $\langle \rho\,,\, P\rangle = 1$.

In the sequel the term projection will mean orthogonal projection. We shall freely use properties of the complete orthocomplemented lattice of projections. Projections P, Q are called *orthogonal*, $P \perp Q$, if $PQ = 0$, or equivalently, $P + Q \le I$, or $P \le I - Q =: Q^\perp$. The supremum of a family of projections $P^{(\alpha)}$, $\alpha \in A$, will be denoted $\bigvee_{\alpha\in A} P^{(\alpha)}$. Note that the projections Π_φ introduced in Definition 2 are the support projections of $T(P_\varphi)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $T : V \to \tilde V$ be a stochastic map. The following are equivalent:*
(i) T is isometric;
(ii) $T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) = \Pi(\rho)$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}$;
(iii) $T^*\left(\Pi(T(P_\varphi)\right) = P_\varphi$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$.

Proof. Assume that T is a stochastic isometry. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{S}$, then $0 \le T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) \le I$, and $\langle \rho\,, T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right)\rangle = \langle T(\rho)\,, \Pi(T(\rho))\rangle = 1$. Therefore, $\Pi(\rho) \le T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right)$. We show that also $T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) \le \Pi(\rho)$, so that both operators are equal.

Write $\Pi(\rho)^\perp = \sum_k P_{\varphi_k}$. Then $P_{\varphi_k} \perp \Pi(\rho)$, and so $P_{\varphi_k} \perp \rho$. Since T is an orthogonality preserving stochastic map [by Proposition 2.1], it follows that $T(P_{\varphi_k}) \perp T(\rho)$. Then

$$0 = \langle T(P_{\varphi_k})\,, \Pi(T(\rho))\rangle = \langle P_{\varphi_k}\,, T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right)\rangle.$$

This gives $P_{\varphi_k}\cdot T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) = 0$ and therefore one has $\Pi(\rho)^\perp\cdot T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) = 0$. Since $T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) \le I$, it follows that $T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) \le \Pi(\rho)$. Thus, $T^*\left(\Pi(T(\rho))\right) = \Pi(\rho)$.

Conversely, assume (ii) holds. We show that the stochastic map T is orthogonality preserving and thus, by Proposition 2.1, an isometry. Let $\rho, \sigma \in S$, $\rho \perp \sigma$. Then $\langle T(\rho)\,, \Pi(T(\sigma))\rangle = \langle \rho\,, T^*\left(\Pi(T(\sigma))\right)\rangle = \langle \rho\,, \Pi(\sigma)\rangle = 0$. This implies $T(\rho) \perp T(\sigma)$.

Property (iii) is entailed by (ii). The converse implication is a fairly straightforward consequence of the fact that T^* is normal. ☐

Lemma 4.2. *Let $T : V \to \tilde V$ be a stochastic isometry and not pure. There exists a strictly decreasing sequence $\tilde w_\nu$, $0 < \tilde w_\nu < 1$, $\nu = 1, 2, \cdots, N \le \infty$, and a sequence of numbers $m_\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_\nu \tilde w_\nu m_\nu = 1$ and*

$$T(P_\varphi) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} \tilde w_\nu \Pi_\varphi^\nu \tag{4.1}$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$. Here the Π_φ^ν are projections with rank m_ν. Furthermore, $\Pi_\varphi^\nu \perp \Pi_\psi^\mu$ for all $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$ if $\nu \ne \mu$.

Proof. For $\varphi, \psi \ne 0$, write the spectral decompositions of $T(P_\varphi)$, $T(P_\psi)$ as

$$T(P_\varphi) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} a_\nu P_{\varphi_\nu}\,, \quad T(P_\psi) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{M} b_\mu P_{\psi_\mu}\,, \tag{4.2}$$

respectively, where the φ_ν and ψ_μ form orthonormal systems, $N, M \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, and the a_ν, b_μ are the nonzero eigenvalues. We show that the eigenvalues coincide in numerical values and multiplicities. First observe that $P_{\varphi_\nu} \le \Pi(T(P_\varphi))$, so that, by virtue of Lemma 4.2, $T^*\big(P_{\varphi_\nu}\big) \le P_\varphi$, $\langle P_\varphi\, , T^*(P_{\varphi_\nu})\rangle = \langle T(P_\varphi)\, , P_{\varphi_\nu}\rangle = a_\nu$, and therefore

$$T^*(P_{\varphi_\nu}) \; = \; a_\nu P_\varphi . \tag{4.3}$$

Similarly,

$$T^*(P_{\psi_\mu}) \; = \; b_\mu P_\psi . \tag{4.4}$$

Case 1: $0 \ne |\langle \varphi | \psi \rangle| (\ne 1)$. Take unit vectors φ', ψ' in the span of φ, ψ such that $\langle \varphi | \varphi' \rangle = \langle \psi | \psi' \rangle = 0$. Then $P_\varphi + P_{\varphi'} = P_\psi + P_{\psi'}$ and therefore $T(P_\varphi) + T(P_{\varphi'}) = T(P_\psi) + T(P_{\psi'})$. Since T is orthogonality preserving, this yields:

$$\big(T(P_\varphi)\big)^2 = T(P_\psi)T(P_\varphi) + T(P_{\psi'})T(P_\varphi),$$

and so

$$T(P_\psi)\,\big(T(P_\varphi)\big)^2 = \big(T(P_\psi)\big)^2 T(P_\varphi),$$

and hence by induction

$$\big(T(P_\psi)\big)^n \big(T(P_\varphi)\big)^m = \big(T(P_\psi)\big)^m \big(T(P_\varphi)\big)^n, \quad n, m \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.5}$$

On multiplication of Eq. (4.5) with P_{ψ_μ} from the left and with P_{φ_ν} from the right, we obtain

$$b_\mu^n a_\nu^m P_{\psi_\mu} P_{\varphi_\nu} = b_\mu^m a_\nu^n \, P_{\psi_\mu} P_{\varphi_\nu} . \tag{4.6}$$

Choosing $n = 2, m = 1$, one concludes that

$$a_\nu = b_\mu \quad \text{whenever} \quad P_{\psi_\mu} P_{\varphi_\nu} \ne 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Applying (4.5) again, one can write

$$\langle \big(T(P_\psi)\big)^{n-1}\, , T(P_\varphi)\rangle = \langle T(P_\psi)\, , \big(T(P_\varphi)\big)^{n-1}\rangle, \; n \ge 2,$$

that is, by virtue of (4.2),

$$\sum_\mu b_\mu^{n-1} \langle P_{\psi_\mu}\, , T(P_\varphi)\rangle = \sum_\nu a_\nu^{n-1} \langle T(P_\psi)\, , P_{\varphi_\nu}\rangle.$$

Observing that [by virtue of (4.3),(4.4)]

$$\langle P_{\psi_\mu}\, , T(P_\varphi)\rangle \;=\; \langle T^*(P_{\psi_\mu})\, , P_\varphi\rangle = b_\mu \langle P_\psi\, , P_\varphi\rangle, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\langle T(P_\psi)\, , P_{\varphi_\nu}\rangle \;=\; \langle P_\psi\, , T^*(P_{\varphi_\nu})\rangle = a_\nu \langle P_\psi\, , P_\varphi\rangle, \tag{4.9}$$

and using the fact that $\langle P_\psi\, , P_\varphi\rangle \ne 0$, we obtain

$$\sum_\nu a_\nu^n = \sum_\mu b_\mu^n, \quad \text{for all} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.10}$$

We rewrite this, making the multiplicities explicit: thus we let $a_1, a_2, \cdots$ and $b_1, b_2, \cdots$ denote the strictly decreasing sequences of eigenvalues of $T(P_\varphi)$, $T(P_\psi)$, with multiplicities n_ν, m_μ, respectively. Then Eq. (4.10) reads:

$$\sum_\nu n_\nu a_\nu^n = \sum_\mu m_\mu b_\mu^n, \quad \text{for all} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.11}$$

The orthonormal systems of eigenvectors shall now be denoted $\varphi_{\nu,i}$, $\psi_{\mu,j}$, where $i \in \{1, \cdots, n_\nu\}$, $j \in \{1, \cdots, m_\mu\}$. Now observe that due to (4.8),(4.9),

$$\langle T(P_\psi), P_{\varphi_{\nu,i}} \rangle = \langle P_\psi, T^*(P_{\varphi_{\nu,i}}) \rangle = a_\nu \langle P_\psi, P_\varphi \rangle,$$

which implies that for each ν there must be μ, j such that $\langle P_{\psi_{\mu,j}}, P_{\varphi_{\nu,i}} \rangle \neq 0$. Therefore, by (4.7), $a_\nu = b_\mu$. A similar reasoning entails that for each μ there must be ν such that $a_\nu = b_\mu$. Since the two sequences of eigenvalues are strictly decreasing, they must be identical: $a_\nu = b_\nu$, for all values of ν. It remains to be shown that the multiplicities coincide as well. Equation (4.11) can be written as

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{N} (n_\nu - m_\nu)\, a_\nu^n \;=\; 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.12}$$

We show that $x_\nu := n_\nu - m_\nu = 0$ for all $\nu = 1, \cdots, N$. This is obvious for $N = 1$. So let $N > 1$. Suppose $x_1 \neq 0$. Then (4.12) gives

$$0 = 1 + (a_1^n x_1)^{-1} \sum_{\kappa=2}^{N} a_\kappa^n x_\kappa,$$

that is,

$$\sum_{\kappa=2}^{N} \left(\frac{a_\kappa}{a_1}\right)^n \frac{x_\kappa}{x_1} = -1.$$

But then

$$1 = \left| \sum_{\kappa=2}^{N} \left(\frac{a_\kappa}{a_1}\right)^n \frac{x_\kappa}{x_1} \right| \le \sum_{\kappa=2}^{N} \left(\frac{a_\kappa}{a_1}\right)^n \left| \frac{x_\kappa}{x_1} \right| =: S(n) \ (< \infty).$$

Since $a_1 > a_2 > \cdots$, we also have:

$$S(n+1) = \sum_{\kappa=2}^{N} \left(\frac{a_\kappa}{a_1}\right)^{n+1} \left| \frac{x_\kappa}{x_1} \right| \le \left(\frac{a_2}{a_1}\right)^n S(1).$$

Hence $S(n) \downarrow 0$ and $S(n) \ge 1$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $x_1 = 0$. The argument can be repeated for $x_2, x_3, \cdots$ to yield $x_\nu = 0$ for all ν. Note that Eq. (4.7) also implies

$$\langle P_{\psi_{\mu,j}}, P_{\varphi_{\nu,i}} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \nu \neq \mu. \tag{4.13}$$

Finally we get, putting $a_\nu = \tilde{w}_\nu$:

$$T(P_\varphi) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_\nu \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_\nu} P_{\varphi_{\nu,i}} \right), \quad T(P_\psi) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} \tilde{w}_\nu \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_\nu} P_{\psi_{\nu,j}} \right), \tag{4.14}$$

where $\sum_\nu \tilde{w}_\nu n_\nu = 1$. This is of the form of Eq. (4.1), and due to (4.13) the projections Π_φ^ν, Π_ψ^μ are mutually orthogonal for any $\varphi, \psi \neq 0$ ($\langle \varphi | \psi \rangle \neq 0$) if $\nu \neq \mu$.

Case 2: $\langle \varphi \,|\, \psi \rangle = 0$. Replace ψ by a unit vector $\tilde{\psi}$ in the span of φ, ψ and not parallel to φ or ψ. Then apply the argument of Case 1 to obtain equations (4.14) for the pairs $\varphi, \tilde{\psi}$ and $\tilde{\psi}, \psi$. It follows that equations of this form also hold for orthogonal pairs φ, ψ. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *be a stochastic isometry. There exists a complete family of mutually orthogonal projections* P_ν, $\nu = 0, 1, \cdots, N \leq \infty$, $\sum_{\nu=0}^{N} P_\nu = I$, *such that*

$$T(\rho) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{N} P_\nu \, T(\rho) \, P_\nu \, . \tag{4.15}$$

For $\nu = 1, \cdots, N$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$, *let* Π_φ^ν *be the projections of rank* m_ν *established in Lemma 4.2. Then* $P_\nu = \bigvee_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}} \Pi_\varphi^\nu$ *for* $\nu = 1, \cdots N$, *and* $P_0 = I - \sum_{\nu=1}^{N} P_\nu$.

Proof. The projections P_ν are mutually orthogonal by virtue of the orthogonality of all Π_φ^ν, Π_ψ^μ, $\nu \neq \mu$. Then $P_\nu \Pi_\varphi^\mu = \delta_{\mu\nu} \Pi_\varphi^\nu = \Pi_\varphi^\mu P_\nu$, and so $\sum_\nu P_\nu T(P_\varphi) P_\nu = \sum_\nu \tilde{w}_\nu \Pi_\varphi^\nu = T(P_\varphi)$. By continuity of T, this equality extends to all $T(\rho)$, $\rho \in V$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.3. For the $\tilde{w}_\nu, m_\nu$ given in Lemma 4.2, put $w_\nu = \tilde{w}_\nu m_\nu$, and define the maps T_ν via

$$T_\nu(P_\varphi) := \frac{1}{m_\nu} \Pi_\varphi^\nu = {w_\nu}^{-1} P_\nu T(P_\varphi) P_\nu \, ,$$

with the projections $P_\nu, \nu = 1, 2, \cdots, N$ given in Lemma 4.3. Then (4.1) realizes (3.3), and in view of (4.15), the maps T_ν are mixing stochastic maps on V with ranges in $\mathcal{H}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\nu)_s$, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\nu = P_\nu \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$.

5. Mixing Stochastic Isometries

We establish some properties of the m-mixing stochastic isometries which are instrumental in proving Proposition 3.4. The proof given here applies Hilbert space techniques and emphasizes elementary geometrical aspects, particularly the preservation of orthogonality. In the appendix an alternative proof is presented that is based on a link with Kadison's characterization of isometries of operator algebras.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *be an* m*-mixing stochastic isometry, with* $T(P_\phi) = \frac{1}{m} \Pi_\phi$, $\phi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$. *Let* $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}, \xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ *be unit vectors. Then the following hold:*

$$P_\xi \leq \Pi_\varphi \quad \Longrightarrow \quad T^*(P_\xi) \; = \; \frac{1}{m} P_\varphi ; \tag{5.1}$$

$$P_\xi \leq \Pi_\varphi \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \langle P_\xi \, , \, \Pi_\psi \rangle \; = \; \langle P_\varphi \, , \, P_\psi \rangle ; \tag{5.2}$$

$$\Pi_\varphi \Pi_\psi \Pi_\varphi \; = \; \langle P_\varphi \, , \, P_\psi \rangle \, \Pi_\varphi \, . \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. Let $P_\xi \le \Pi_\varphi = mT(P_\varphi)$. Then by Lemma 4.1, $0 \le T^*(P_\xi) \le T^*(\Pi_\varphi) = P_\varphi$, and therefore $T^*(P_\xi) = a\,P_\varphi$, $0 \le a \le 1$. Further, $1 = \langle P_\xi\,,\,\Pi_\varphi\rangle = \langle T^*(P_\xi)\,,\,m\,P_\varphi\rangle = a\cdot m$, hence $a = \frac{1}{m}$. This proves (5.1).

Let $P_\xi \le \Pi_\varphi$, then with $\Pi_\psi = mT(P_\psi)$ and (5.1) one obtains

$$\langle P_\xi\,,\,\Pi_\psi\rangle = m\langle T^*(P_\xi)\,,\,P_\psi\rangle = \langle P_\varphi\,,\,P_\psi\rangle,$$

that is, (5.2).

Let $\{\varphi_k | k = 1,\cdots m\}\cup\{\varphi'_\ell | \ell\in L\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\Pi_\varphi = \sum_{k=1}^m P_{\varphi_k}$ and thus $\Pi_\varphi\varphi'_\ell = 0$ for all ℓ. Then the only nonvanishing matrix elements of the (finite rank) operator $\Pi_\varphi\Pi_\psi P_\varphi$ are those obtained from the φ_k, and (5.3) is equivalent to

$$\langle\,\varphi_j\,|\,\Pi_\psi\,\varphi_k\,\rangle = \langle P_\varphi\,,\,P_\psi\rangle\,\delta_{jk}. \tag{5.4}$$

For $j = k$ one has $\langle\,\varphi_k\,|\,\Pi_\psi\,\varphi_k\,\rangle = \langle P_{\varphi_k}\,,\,\Pi_\psi\rangle$, which equals $\langle P_\varphi\,,\,P_\psi\rangle$ by virtue of (5.2).

For $j \ne k$, consider the unit vectors $\eta := (\varphi_j + \alpha\varphi_k)/\sqrt{2}$, $|\alpha| = 1$. We have $P_\eta \le \Pi_\varphi$ and therefore, by (5.2),

$$\langle P_\eta\,,\,\Pi_\psi\rangle = \langle P_\varphi\,,\,P_\psi\rangle. \tag{5.5}$$

Now observe that for any unit vectors φ,ψ, $a\varphi + b\psi$ $(a,b\in\mathbb{C})$, the projection $P_{a\varphi+b\psi}$ can be written as

$$P_{a\varphi+b\psi} \;=\; |a|^2P_\varphi + |b|^2P_\psi + a\overline{b}\,A_{\varphi\psi} + \overline{a}b\,A_{\psi\varphi}, \tag{5.6}$$

where $A_{\varphi\psi}$is the operator of rank one defined via

$$A_{\varphi\psi}\xi \;=\; \varphi\,\langle\,\psi\,|\,\xi\,\rangle\,,\quad \xi\in\mathcal{H}. \tag{5.7}$$

Thus we obtain

$$P_\eta \;=\; P_{(\varphi_j+a\varphi_k)/\sqrt{2}} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{2}P_{\varphi_j} + \tfrac{1}{2}P_{\varphi_k} + \tfrac{1}{2}\{a\,A_{\varphi_k\varphi_j} + \overline{a}\,A_{\varphi_j\varphi_k}\}. \tag{5.8}$$

Again by (5.2), we have $\langle P_{\varphi_j}\,,\,\Pi_\psi\rangle = \langle P_{\varphi_k}\,,\,\Pi_\psi\rangle = \langle P_\varphi\,,\,P_\psi\rangle$. Then combining (5.8) and (5.5) yields

$$\mathrm{Re}\,\{a\,\langle\,\varphi_j\,|\,\Pi_\psi\,\varphi_k\,\rangle\} = 0.$$

Choosing for a the values $a = 1, i$, one concludes that $\langle\,\varphi_j\,|\,\Pi_\psi\,\varphi_k\,\rangle = 0$. Hence (5.4) follows, and so (5.3) is verified. □

Proposition 5.1. *Let $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ be an m-mixing stochastic map. The following statements are equivalent.*

(i) T is a stochastic isometry;

(ii) $P_\xi \le \Pi_\varphi \implies T^*(P_\xi) = \frac{1}{m}P_\varphi$ for all $\varphi\in\mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}, \xi\in\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\backslash\{0\}$;

(iii) $P_\xi \le \Pi_\varphi \implies \langle P_\xi\,,\,\Pi_\psi\rangle = \langle P_\varphi\,,\,P_\psi\rangle$ for all $\xi,\varphi,\psi\in\mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}, \xi\in\tilde{\mathcal{H}}\backslash\{0\}$;

(iv) $\Pi_\varphi\Pi_\psi\Pi_\varphi = \langle P_\varphi\,,\,P_\psi\rangle\,\Pi_\varphi$ for all $\varphi,\psi\in\mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$.

Proof. According to Lemma 5.1, (i) implies each of the statements (ii), (iii), (iv). We show that each of the latter statements implies that T is orthogonality preserving for pairs of pure states, so that, by Proposition 2.1, T is a stochastic isometry.

Assume (ii) holds. Let $P_\varphi \perp P_\psi$. Take $\xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}\backslash\{0\}$ such that $P_\xi \le \Pi_\varphi$. Then

$$\langle P_\xi \,, \Pi_\psi \rangle = \langle P_\xi \,, mT(P_\psi)\rangle = \langle mT^*(P_\xi)\,, P_\psi \rangle = \langle P_\varphi \,, P_\psi \rangle = 0.$$

Hence $P_\xi \perp \Pi_\psi$. This holds for any $P_\xi \le \Pi_\varphi$, and therefore $\Pi_\varphi \perp \Pi_\psi$.

Assume (iii) holds. Let $P_\varphi \perp P_\psi$. It follows that for any $\xi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}\backslash\{0\}$ with $P_\xi \le \Pi_\varphi$, $\langle P_\xi \,, \Pi_\psi \rangle = \langle P_\varphi \,, P_\psi \rangle = 0$, and therefore $\Pi_\varphi \perp \Pi_\psi$.

Assume (iv) holds. Let $P_\varphi \perp P_\psi$. It follows that $\Pi_\varphi \Pi_\psi \Pi_\varphi = \langle P_\varphi \,, P_\psi \rangle \Pi_\varphi = 0$, and so $\Pi_\varphi \perp \Pi_\psi$. □

The following generalization of the relation (5.3) will be crucial.

Proposition 5.2. *Let T be an m-mixing stochastic isometry. For unit vectors $\varphi, \psi, \vartheta \in \mathcal{H}$, the following relation holds between the projections $\Pi_\varphi = mT(P_\varphi)$, $\Pi_\psi = mT(P_\psi)$, $\Pi_\vartheta = mT(P_\vartheta)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\varphi \Pi_\vartheta \Pi_\psi \Pi_\varphi &= a\, \Pi_\varphi^{(L)} + \overline{a}\, \Pi_\varphi^{(A)}, \\ a &= \langle \varphi \,|\, \vartheta \rangle\, \langle \vartheta \,|\, \psi \rangle\, \langle \psi \,|\, \varphi \rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Here $\Pi_\varphi^{(L)}, \Pi_\varphi^{(A)}$ are projections independent of ψ, ϑ and determined solely by P_φ. They satisfy $\Pi_\varphi^{(L)} + \Pi_\varphi^{(A)} = \Pi_\varphi$.

The proof will be based the study of a number of special cases and on exploiting the linearity of T. We note two trivial special cases: if any single pair among the three vectors are mutually orthogonal then the left hand side of Eq. (5.9) is identically 0; and if any two of these vectors are linearly dependent then (5.9) reduces to (5.3).

Lemma 5.2. *Let T be an m-mixing stochastic isometry. For any pair of mutually orthogonal unit vectors $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ the following holds:*

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1} \Pi_{\varphi_1 + i\varphi_2} \Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2} \Pi_{\varphi_1} \;=\; \tfrac{1+i}{4}\, \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(L)} \;+\; \tfrac{1-i}{4}\, \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(A)}. \tag{5.10}$$

Here $\Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(L)}, \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(A)}$ are projections satisfying $\Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(L)} + \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(A)} = \Pi_{\varphi_1}$.

Proof. We note first that at this stage we do not claim the independence of the projections $\Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(L)}, \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(A)}$ of the choice of φ_2. This will be established in a later step.

We will frequently use Eqs. (5.2) and (5.3) without explicit mentioning. Let $\{\varphi_{1k} \,|\, k = 1, \cdots, m\}$ be an arbitrary orthonormal basis (ONB) of the subspace $\Pi_{\varphi_1}\mathcal{H}$. Then, by virtue of Eq. (5.3), for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\alpha| = 1$, the system of vectors $\varphi_{2k}(\alpha) = 2\Pi_{\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\varphi_{1k}$, $k = 1, \cdots, m$, form an ONB of

$\Pi_{\varphi_2}\mathcal{H}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\left(\varphi_{1k}+\varphi_{2k}(\alpha)\right) &= \Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\left(\varphi_{1k}\right)+2\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\left(\varphi_{1k}\right)\\
&= 2\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\left(\varphi_{1k}\right)\\
&= 2\left(\Pi_{\varphi_1}+\Pi_{\varphi_2}\right)\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1}\left(\varphi_{1k}\right) \qquad (5.11)\\
&= \varphi_{1k}+\varphi_{2k}(\alpha)
\end{aligned}$$

In the third line we have used the fact that $\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\perp\Pi_{\varphi_1-\alpha\varphi_2}$ (since T is orthogonality preserving) and that, by virtue of the linearity of T,

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}+\Pi_{\varphi_1-\alpha\varphi_2}=\Pi_{\varphi_1}+\Pi_{\varphi_2},$$

and therefore

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_2}\leq\Pi_{\varphi_1}+\Pi_{\varphi_2}. \qquad (5.12)$$

Let us denote $\varphi_{2k}(1)=\varphi_{2k}$ and $\varphi_{2k}(i)=\varphi'_{2k}$. Then (5.11) entails $P_{\varphi_{1k}+\varphi_{2k}}\leq\Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}$, and so [by (5.2)]

$$\langle P_{\varphi_{1k}+\varphi_{2k}}\,,\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\rangle=\langle P_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}\,,\,P_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{4}|1+i|^2=\tfrac{1}{2}. \qquad (5.13)$$

But from (5.6) we have

$$P_{\varphi_{1k}+\varphi_{2k}}=\tfrac{1}{2}P_{\varphi_{1k}}+\tfrac{1}{2}P_{\varphi_{2k}}+\tfrac{1}{2}\left[A_{\varphi_{1k}\varphi_{2k}}+A_{\varphi_{2k}\varphi_{1k}}\right].$$

Using this to evaluate the left hand side of (5.13), and noting that $\langle P_{\varphi_{1k}}\,,\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\rangle=\langle P_{\varphi_{2k}}\,,\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\rangle=\frac{1}{2}$, we can conclude that

$$\mathrm{Re}\left\langle\,\varphi_{2k}\,|\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\varphi_{1k}\,\right\rangle=\mathrm{Re}\left\langle\,\varphi_{2k}\,|\,\varphi'_{2k}\,\right\rangle=0. \qquad (5.14)$$

Next we observe that the operator

$$U:=4\left(\Pi_{\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1}\right)^*\Pi_{\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1}=4\Pi_{\varphi_1}\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1}$$

is a partial isometry that acts as a unitary operator on $\Pi_{\varphi_1}\mathcal{H}$; i.e. $U^*U=UU^*=\Pi_{\varphi}$. Take the ONB $\{\varphi_{1k}\,:\,k=1,\cdots,m\}$ to be a set of eigenvectors of this operator, $U\varphi_{1k}=u_k\varphi_{1k}$, $|u_k|=1$. It follows that

$$\left\langle\,\varphi'_{2k}\,|\,\varphi_{2\ell}\,\right\rangle=\left\langle\,\varphi_{1k}\,|\,U\varphi_{1\ell}\,\right\rangle=u_k\delta_{k\ell}.$$

Combining this with (5.14), it follows that $u_k\in\{+i,-i\}$ for all k. Denote the spectral projections of the partial isometry U associated with the eigenvalues $i,-i$ as $\Pi^{(L)}_{\varphi_1}$, $\Pi^{(A)}_{\varphi_1}$, respectively. Then the spectral decomposition of U is

$$U=i\left(\Pi^{(L)}_{\varphi_1}-\Pi^{(A)}_{\varphi_1}\right),\quad\Pi^{(L)}_{\varphi_1}+\Pi^{(A)}_{\varphi_1}=\Pi_{\varphi_1}. \qquad (5.15)$$

Finally we can write the operator on the left hand side of (5.10) as

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1}\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1}=\Pi_{\varphi_1}\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\left(\Pi_{\varphi_1}+\Pi_{\varphi_2}\right)\Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1}=\tfrac{1}{4}(\Pi_{\varphi_1}+U),$$

where by virtue of (5.15) the last expression equals the right hand side of (5.10). $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *Let* $\dim \mathcal{H} > 2$ *and* $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ *be an* m*-mixing stochastic isometry,* $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3 \in \mathcal{H}$ *a triple of mutually orthogonal unit vectors,* $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$*,* $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$*,* $k, \ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$*. Then:*

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1} \;=\; \tfrac{1+i}{4}\,\Pi^{(L)}_{\varphi_1} \;+\; \tfrac{1-i}{4}\,\Pi^{(A)}_{\varphi_1}; \tag{5.16}$$

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\beta\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{4}\Pi_{\varphi_1}; \tag{5.17}$$

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_2+\alpha\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_k+\beta\varphi_\ell}\Pi_{\varphi_1} \;=\; 0; \tag{5.18}$$

$$\Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_1} \;=\; \tfrac{1+i}{4}\,\widetilde{\Pi}^{(L)}_{\varphi_1} \;+\; \tfrac{1-i}{4}\,\widetilde{\Pi}^{(A)}_{\varphi_1}. \tag{5.19}$$

Proof. We do not claim here that $\widetilde{\Pi}^{(L,A)}_{\varphi_1} = \Pi^{(L,A)}_{\varphi_1}$, nor that these projections are independent of the choice of φ_2, φ_3. This will be established in a later step.

Relations (5.16) and (5.19) are instances of Lemma 5.2. Due to $\Pi_{\varphi_2+\alpha\varphi_3} \leq \Pi_{\varphi_2} + \Pi_{\varphi_3}$ [cf. Eq. (5.12)], we have $\Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_2+\alpha\varphi_3} = 0$, which proves (5.18). To verify (5.17), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\beta\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1} &= \Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_3}\left(\Pi_{\varphi_1} + \Pi_{\varphi_2} + \Pi_{\varphi_3}\right)\Pi_{\varphi_1+\beta\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1}\\ &= \Pi_{\varphi_1}\,\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_1}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\beta\varphi_2}\Pi_{\varphi_1} = \tfrac{1}{4}\Pi_{\varphi_1}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the orthogonalities: $\Pi_{\varphi_1+\alpha\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_2} = \Pi_{\varphi_3}\Pi_{\varphi_1+\beta\varphi_2} = 0$. □

Approaching the proof of Proposition 5.2, we observe that any triple of pairwise independent unit vectors φ , ψ, ϑ spans a subspace $[\varphi, \psi, \vartheta]$ of $\mathcal{H}$ of dimension 2 or 3. We assume $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$. As will be made evident, the case $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$ can be dealt with by restriction of the constructions to be carried out for the case $\dim \mathcal{H} > 2$. Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3$ be three mutually orthogonal unit vectors such that $[\varphi, \psi, \vartheta] \subseteq [\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] =: \mathcal{K}$. Then the nine operators $A_{\varphi_k\varphi_\ell}$ [cf. (5.7)] form a basis of the space of operators on $\mathcal{K}$. By polarization, an alternative basis is given by the operators

$$\begin{aligned}&P_{\varphi_1}, P_{\varphi_2}, P_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}, P_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2},\\ &P_{\varphi_3}, P_{\varphi_1+\varphi_3}, P_{\varphi_2+\varphi_3}, P_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_3}, P_{\varphi_2+i\varphi_3}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

We denote these P_{ξ_k}, $k = 1, \cdots, 9$, in the ordering given. It follows that the corresponding set of projections Π_{ξ_k}, $k = 1, \cdots, 9$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pi_{\varphi_1}, \Pi_{\varphi_2}, \Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_2}, \Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_2},\\ &\Pi_{\varphi_3}, \Pi_{\varphi_1+\varphi_3}, \Pi_{\varphi_2+\varphi_3}, \Pi_{\varphi_1+i\varphi_3}, \Pi_{\varphi_2+i\varphi_3}\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

forms a basis of the space of operators spanned by all Π_φ, $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}\backslash\{0\}$.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Step 1. Excluding the trivial cases mentioned immediately after Proposition 5.2, we need to verify Eq. (5.9) for any triple of unit vectors $\varphi, \psi, \vartheta \in \mathcal{H}$ which are pairwise independent and nonorthogonal. Consider the case $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$. We work with a specific choice of ONB $\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3\}$ of $\mathcal{K}$, namely, $\varphi_1 = \varphi$, $\varphi_2 \perp \varphi_1$ such that $\psi \in [\varphi_1, \varphi_2]$, and $\varphi_3 \perp [\varphi_1, \varphi_2]$ such that $\vartheta \in [\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3] = \mathcal{K}$. Using the operator bases (5.20) and (5.21), and denoting these operators as P_{ξ_k}, Π_{ξ_k} in the order given, we can write

$$P_\psi = \sum_{k=1}^{4} s_k P_{\xi_k}, \quad P_\vartheta = \sum_{\ell=1}^{9} t_\ell P_{\xi_\ell},$$

and

$$\Pi_\psi = \sum_{k=1}^{4} s_k \Pi_{\xi_k}, \quad \Pi_\vartheta = \sum_{\ell=1}^{9} t_\ell \Pi_{\xi_\ell},$$

with all $s_k, t_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$. With this we find:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\varphi\ P_\vartheta\ P_\psi P_\varphi &= \langle\,\varphi\,|\,\vartheta\,\rangle\ \langle\,\vartheta\,|\,\psi\,\rangle\ \langle\,\psi\,|\,\varphi\,\rangle\ P_\varphi \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{4}\sum_{\ell=1}^{9} s_k t_\ell P_\varphi P_{\xi_\ell} P_{\xi_k} P_\varphi \qquad (5.22) \\ &= \{s_1t_1 + \tfrac{1}{2}s_1t_3 + \tfrac{1}{2}s_1t_4 + \tfrac{1}{2}s_1t_6 + \tfrac{1}{2}s_1t_8 \\ &\quad +\tfrac{1}{2}s_3t_1 + \tfrac{1}{2}s_3t_3 + \tfrac{1+i}{4}s_3t_4 + \tfrac{1}{4}s_3t_6 + \tfrac{1}{4}s_3t_8 \\ &\quad +\tfrac{1}{2}s_4t_1 + \tfrac{1-i}{4}s_4t_3 + \tfrac{1}{2}s_4t_4 + \tfrac{1}{4}s_4t_6 + \tfrac{1}{4}s_4t_8\}\, P_\varphi\,. \end{aligned}$$

Next, applying Eqs. (5.16,5.17,5.18) [the expression (5.19) does not occur], we evaluate the corresponding sum for the left hand side of Eq. (5.9):

$$\Pi_\varphi \Pi_\vartheta \Pi_\psi \Pi_\varphi = \sum_{k=1}^{4}\sum_{\ell=1}^{9} s_k t_\ell \Pi_\varphi \Pi_{\xi_\ell} \Pi_{\xi_k} \Pi_\varphi = a\Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(L)} + \overline{a}\Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(A)}, \qquad (5.23)$$

where a turns out to be the same expression as that given in the braces $\{\cdots\}$ in Eq. (5.22). Hence, $a = \langle\,\varphi\,|\,\vartheta\,\rangle\ \langle\,\vartheta\,|\,\psi\,\rangle\ \langle\,\psi\,|\,\varphi\,\rangle$, and Eq. (5.9) is verified. Note that the case $\dim\mathcal{H} = 2$ is covered by putting $s_k = t_k = 0$ for $k > 4$.

Step 2. Next we show that the spectral projections occurring in Eq. (5.9) do not depend on the choice of $\psi, \vartheta \in \mathcal{H}$. Note that the result of Step 1 holds for any choice of unit vectors $\vartheta \in \mathcal{H}$, and thus for any choice of $\varphi_3 \perp [\varphi_1, \varphi_2]$ in the case $\dim\mathcal{H} \geq 3$. The construction of $\Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(L)}, \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(A)}$ so far depends on the choice of $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, but only via $\varphi_2 \perp \varphi_1$. In the case $\dim\mathcal{H} = 2$, the ray orthogonal to φ_1 is uniquely determined by that vector, so that the spectral projections in Eq. (5.23) are the same for all ψ, ϑ. In the case $\dim\mathcal{H} \geq 3$, we have to show that these projections are actually the same for *all* choices of unit vectors $\varphi_2' \perp \varphi_1$ [including $\varphi_2' = \varphi_3$, cf. Eq. (5.19)]. To this end we repeat the procedure of Step 1, this time choosing a unit vector $\varphi_2' \perp \varphi_1 = \varphi$ in the plane $[\varphi, \vartheta]$. Then there exists a unit vector φ_3' such that $\psi \in [\varphi_1, \varphi_2', \varphi_3'] = \mathcal{K}$. We obtain again a spectral decomposition of the form (5.23),

$$\Pi_\varphi \Pi_\vartheta \Pi_\psi \Pi_\varphi = a{\Pi'_\varphi}^{(L)} + \overline{a}{\Pi'_\varphi}^{(A)}, \quad {\Pi'_\varphi}^{(L)} + {\Pi'_\varphi}^{(A)} = \Pi_\varphi, \qquad (5.24)$$

for the *same* set of vectors φ, ψ, ϑ. Provided that the eigenvalues $a, \overline{a}$ do not coincide, i.e. $a \notin \mathbb{R}$, then the spectral projections ${\Pi'_\varphi}^{(L)}, {\Pi'_\varphi}^{(A)}$ constructed from φ_1, φ_2' along the lines of the proof of Lemma 5.2 coincide with the projections $\Pi_\varphi^{(L)}, \Pi_\varphi^{(A)}$ constructed from φ_1, φ_2.

We show that, given φ, ψ, any $\varphi_2' \perp \varphi_1$ can be realized with a choice of ϑ such that $a = \langle \varphi_1 \,|\, \vartheta \rangle \, \langle \vartheta \,|\, \psi \rangle \, \langle \psi \,|\, \varphi_1 \rangle \notin \mathbb{R}$. Let φ_2' be any unit vector such that $\varphi_2' \perp \varphi$ and $\varphi_2' \not\perp \psi$. Choose $\vartheta = \alpha_1 \varphi_1 + \alpha_2 \varphi_2'$, with α_1, α_2 to be further specified shortly. Take a unit vector φ_3' orthogonal to φ_1, φ_2' and such that $\psi = \beta_1 \varphi_1 + \beta_2 \varphi_2' + \beta_3 \varphi_3'$. Since $\varphi_2' \not\perp \psi$, we have $\beta_1 \neq 0 \neq \beta_2$. We obtain

$$a \;=\; \alpha_1 \left\{ \overline{\alpha}_1 \beta_1 \,+\, \overline{\alpha}_2 \beta_2 \right\} \overline{\beta}_1 \;=\; |\alpha_1|^2 \, |\beta_1|^2 \,+\, \alpha_1 \overline{\alpha}_2 \beta_2 \beta_1 .$$

The first term on the right hand side is real and positive. Then $a \neq \mathbb{R}$ can be easily achieved by proper choice of α_1, α_2. Hence all choices of $\varphi_2' \perp \varphi_1$, $\varphi_2' \neq \varphi_3$ lead to the same spectral decomposition in Eqs. (5.10) or (5.16). [Note that $\varphi_2' = \varphi_3$ would imply $\beta_2 = 0$.]

A continuity argument finally shows that the case $\varphi_2' = \varphi_3$ can be included, too, so that the spectral decompositions in Eqs. (5.16) and (5.19) do indeed coincide. In fact let $\varphi_2^{(n)}$ be a sequence of unit vectors orthogonal to φ_1 and different from φ_3, such that $||\varphi_2^{(n)} - \varphi_3|| \to 0$. Then $P_{\varphi_1 + \alpha \varphi_2^{(n)}}$ converges to $P_{\varphi_1 + \alpha \varphi_3}$ in trace norm. By the continuity of T, $\Pi_{\varphi_1 + \alpha \varphi_2^{(n)}}$ converges to $\Pi_{\varphi_1 + \alpha \varphi_3}$ in trace norm. Then

$$\tfrac{1+i}{4} \, \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(L)} + \tfrac{1-i}{4} \, \Pi_{\varphi_1}^{(A)} \;=\; \Pi_{\varphi_1} \, \Pi_{\varphi_1 + i \varphi_2^{(n)}} \Pi_{\varphi_1 + \varphi_2^{(n)}} \Pi_{\varphi_1} \;\longrightarrow\; \Pi_{\varphi_1} \, \Pi_{\varphi_1 + i \varphi_3} \Pi_{\varphi_1 + \varphi_3} \Pi_{\varphi_1} ,$$

convergence in trace norm. It follows that the first and last expressions coincide. This concludes Step 2.

We introduce the following notation for the operators of Eq. (5.9):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{\vartheta\psi}^{\varphi} \;&=\; \Pi_\varphi \, \Pi_\vartheta \, \Pi_\psi \, \Pi_\varphi \; = a_{\vartheta\psi}^{\varphi} \, \Pi_\varphi^{(L)} \,+\, \overline{a_{\vartheta\psi}^{\varphi}} \, \Pi_\varphi^{(A)} , \\ a_{\vartheta\psi}^{\varphi} \;&=\; \langle \varphi \,|\, \vartheta \rangle \, \langle \vartheta \,|\, \psi \rangle \, \langle \psi \,|\, \varphi \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.3. *Let $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ be an m-mixing stochastic isometry. For any two unit vectors $\varphi \, , \chi \in \mathcal{H}$ one has*

$$\Pi_\chi \Pi_\varphi^{(L)} \Pi_\chi \;=\; \langle P_\chi \, , \, P_\varphi \rangle \Pi_\chi^{(L)} , \quad \Pi_\chi \Pi_\varphi^{(A)} \Pi_\chi \;=\; \langle P_\chi \, , \, P_\varphi \rangle \Pi_\chi^{(A)} ; \tag{5.25}$$

$$\Pi_\varphi^{(L)} \Pi_\chi^{(A)} \;=\; \Pi_\varphi^{(A)} \Pi_\chi^{(L)} \;=\; 0. \tag{5.26}$$

The projections

$$P^{(L)} = \bigvee_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}} \Pi_\varphi^{(L)} , \qquad P^{(A)} = \bigvee_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}} \Pi_\varphi^{(A)} \tag{5.27}$$

are mutually orthogonal. Moreover, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\Pi_\varphi^{(L)} \;=\; P^{(L)} \Pi_\varphi , \qquad \Pi_\varphi^{(A)} \;=\; P^{(A)} \Pi_\varphi , \tag{5.28}$$

and the ranks $m^{(L)}, m^{(A)}$ of the projections $\Pi_\varphi^{(L)}$, $\Pi_\varphi^{(A)}$ are independent of $\varphi \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ and satisfy $m^{(L)} + m^{(A)} = m$.

If the invariants $m^{(L)}, m^{(A)}$ *are nonzero, then* T *decomposes into a convex combination of two stochastic isometries* $T^{(L)}, T^{(A)}$ *with orthogonal ranges,*

$$T \;=\; \tfrac{m^{(L)}}{m}\, T^{(L)} \;+\; \tfrac{m^{(A)}}{m}\, T^{(A)}, \tag{5.29}$$

$$T^{(L)}(\rho) \;=\; \tfrac{1}{m^{(L)}}\, P^{(L)}\, T(\rho)\, P^{(L)}, \quad T^{(A)}(\rho) \;=\; \tfrac{1}{m^{(A)}}\, P^{(A)}\, T(\rho)\, P^{(A)}. \tag{5.30}$$

Proof. Let $\chi \in \mathcal{H}$ be a unit vector not orthogonal to φ, and choose any unit vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ neither orthogonal nor parallel to φ, χ and such that $a^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi} \notin \mathbb{R}$. We compute the operator $\Pi_{\chi}\mathcal{W}^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi}\Pi_{\chi}$ in two ways, using (5.3) and noting that $a^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi} = a^{\chi}_{\psi\varphi}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\chi}\mathcal{W}^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi}\Pi_{\chi} \;=\; \langle P_{\chi}\,,\,P_{\varphi}\rangle \mathcal{W}^{\chi}_{\psi\varphi} \;&=\; \langle P_{\chi}\,,\,P_{\varphi}\rangle \left(a^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi}\,\Pi^{(L)}_{\chi} \;+\; \overline{a^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi}}\,\Pi^{(A)}_{\chi} \right) \\ &=\; a^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi}\Pi_{\chi}\Pi^{(L)}_{\varphi}\Pi_{\chi} \;+ \overline{a^{\varphi}_{\chi\psi}}\Pi_{\chi}\Pi^{(A)}_{\varphi}\Pi_{\chi}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that the map $\Pi_{\chi}|_{\Pi_{\varphi}\mathcal{H}} : \Pi_{\varphi}\mathcal{H} \to \Pi_{\chi}\mathcal{H}$ is orthogonality preserving [cf. Eq. (5.4)], Eqs. (5.25) and (5.26) follow by application of Eq. (5.2) and a version of (5.4). The orthogonality of $P^{(L)}, P^{(A)}$ and the relation (5.28) are then obvious.

The invariance of the numbers $m^{(L)}, m^{(A)}$ is a consequence of the fact that Π_{χ} transforms an orthogonal basis of $\Pi^{(L)}_{\varphi}\mathcal{H}$ $[\Pi^{(A)}_{\varphi}\mathcal{H}]$ onto an orthogonal basis of $\Pi^{(L)}_{\chi}\mathcal{H}$ $[\Pi^{(A)}_{\chi}\mathcal{H}]$.

For $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$ we have, by virtue of Eq. (5.28):

$$\begin{aligned} T(P_{\varphi}) \;&=\; \tfrac{1}{m}\,\Pi_{\varphi} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{m}\left(P^{(L)}\,\Pi_{\varphi}\,P^{(L)} \;+\; P^{(A)}\,\Pi_{\varphi}\,P^{(A)} \right) \\ &=\; \tfrac{m^{(L)}}{m}\,T^{(L)}(P_{\varphi}) \;+\; \tfrac{m^{(A)}}{m}\,T^{(A)}(P_{\varphi}). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the linearity and continuity of T this equation extends to all (σ-) convex combinations of pure states and thus to all states ρ and finally to all of V. □

Next we come to analyze the stochastic isometries $T^{(L)}$, $T^{(A)}$, or equivalently, the m-mixing stochastic isometries for which either $m = m^{(L)}$ or $m = m^{(A)}$. We note that

$$\mathcal{W}^{\varphi}_{\vartheta\psi} \;=\; \Pi_{\varphi}\Pi_{\vartheta}\Pi_{\psi}\Pi_{\varphi} \;=\; a^{\varphi}_{\vartheta\psi}\,\Pi_{\varphi}\,, \quad [\text{case } m = m^{(L)}] \tag{5.31}$$

$$\mathcal{W}^{\varphi}_{\vartheta\psi} \;=\; \Pi_{\varphi}\Pi_{\vartheta}\Pi_{\psi}\Pi_{\varphi} \;=\; \overline{a^{\varphi}_{\vartheta\psi}}\,\Pi_{\varphi}\,. \quad [\text{case } m = m^{(A)}] \tag{5.32}$$

Let T be an m-mixing stochastic isometry with $m = m^{(L)}$ or $m = m^{(A)}$. Pick an arbitrary vector $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$ and an orthonormal basis $\{\varphi_1, \cdots, \varphi_m\}$ of $\Pi_{\varphi}\mathcal{H}$. For any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$ with $\psi \not\perp \varphi$, the set of vectors

$$\psi_k := \langle P_{\psi}\,,\,P_{\varphi}\rangle^{-1/2}\Pi_{\psi}\varphi_k \tag{5.33}$$

is an orthonormal basis of $\Pi_{\psi}\mathcal{H}$, cf. Eq. (5.4). Moreover, for any two unit vectors ψ, ϑ not orthogonal to φ, the corresponding basis vectors ψ_k, ϑ_ℓ are mutually orthogonal if $k \neq \ell$. In fact, due to Eqs. (5.31,5.32) we have ($\sim$ denoting proportionality)

$$\langle\, \vartheta_\ell \,|\, \psi_k \,\rangle \sim \langle\, \Pi_\vartheta \varphi_\ell \,|\, \Pi_\psi \varphi_k \,\rangle = \Big\langle\, \varphi_k \,|\, \mathcal{W}^{\varphi}_{\vartheta\psi}\, \varphi_\ell \,\Big\rangle \sim \delta_{k\ell}. \tag{5.34}$$

Proposition 5.4. *Let T be an m-mixing stochastic isometry with $m = m^{(L)}$ or $m = m^{(A)}$. Fix a vector $\varphi^0 \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$ and an orthonormal basis $\{\varphi_1, \cdots, \varphi_m\}$ of $\Pi_{\varphi^0}\mathcal{H}$. The projections*

$$P_k := \bigvee_{\psi \not\perp \varphi^0} P_{\psi_k}. \tag{5.35}$$

are mutually orthogonal. For any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$ there exists a unique ray $P_{\psi_k}\mathcal{H}$, $\psi_k \in \Pi_\psi \mathcal{H}$, such that

$$P_k \Pi_\psi \;=\; \Pi_\psi P_k \;=\; P_{\psi_k}, \quad k = 1, \cdots, m. \tag{5.36}$$

Then

$$P_k \;=\; \bigvee_{\psi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}} P_{\psi_k}, \quad k = 1, \cdots, m, \tag{5.37}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} P_k \;=\; \bigvee_{\varphi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}} \Pi_\varphi\,. \tag{5.38}$$

T decomposes into a convex combination of pure stochastic isometries,

$$T \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{m} \tfrac{1}{m} T_k, \tag{5.39}$$

$$T_k(\rho) \;=\; m\, P_k\, T(\rho)\, P_k. \tag{5.40}$$

Hence there exist maps $U_k : \mathcal{H} \to P_k\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, $k = 1, \cdots, m$, which are all unitary if $m = m^{(L)}$ or all antiunitary if $m = m^{(A)}$, such that $P_k = U_k U_k^*$ and

$$T_k(\rho) \;=\; U_k\, \rho\, U_k^*, \quad \rho \in \mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{H})_s. \tag{5.41}$$

Proof. The orthogonality of the P_k is a direct consequence of Eq. (5.34). Let ψ be a nonzero vector. If $\psi \not\perp \varphi^0$, then take $\psi_k \sim \Pi_\psi \varphi_k$. We have $P_{\psi_k} \leq P_k$ for all k, thus $P_{\psi_k} P_k = P_{\psi_k}$ and, due to the orthogonality of the P_k, $P_{\psi_\ell} P_k = 0$ if $\ell \neq k$. We obtain $P_k \Pi_\psi = P_k \sum_\ell P_{\psi_\ell} = P_k P_{\psi_k} = P_{\psi_k}$. This proves (5.36) for the case $\psi \not\perp \varphi^0$.

Consider the case $\psi \perp \varphi^0$. We assume that φ^0, ψ are unit vectors. Define a sequence of unit vectors $\vartheta^{(n)} := \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{1/2} \varphi^0 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{1/2} \psi \to \psi$ as $n \to \infty$. We can define an ONB of $\Pi_{\vartheta^{(n)}}\mathcal{H}$ as in (5.33), $\vartheta^{(n)}_k \sim \Pi_{\vartheta^{(n)}} \varphi_k$. Using again Eq. (5.31),(5.32), it is easy to verify that for each k, the vectors $\vartheta^{(n)}_k$ form a Cauchy sequence. Let ψ_k denote the limiting unit vector. We show that $P_k \Pi_\psi = P_{\psi_k}$. (This ensures the uniqueness of the ray P_{ψ_k}.)

Let $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ be any vector. One estimates

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \left(P_{\vartheta_k^{(n)}} - P_{\psi_k} \right) \xi \right\| &\leq ||\vartheta_k^{(n)} - \psi_k || \, |\langle \vartheta_k^{(n)} \,|\, \xi \rangle| + \|\psi_k\| \; |\langle \vartheta_k^{(n)} - \psi_k \,|\, \xi \rangle| \\ &\leq 2 \, ||\vartheta_k^{(n)} - \psi_k|| \, \|\xi\| \,.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\left\|P_{\vartheta_k^{(n)}} - P_{\psi_k}\right\| \to 0$ and so $\left\|P_{\vartheta_k^{(n)}} - P_{\psi_k}\right\|_1 \to 0$. We also have $\|P_{\vartheta^{(n)}} - P_\psi\|_1 \to 0$ and therefore, due to the continuity of T, $\|\Pi_{\vartheta^{(n)}} - \Pi_\psi\|_1 \to 0$ and also $\|P_k\Pi_{\vartheta^{(n)}} - P_k\Pi_\psi\|_1 \to 0$. But $P_k\Pi_{\vartheta^{(n)}} = P_{\vartheta_k^{(n)}} \to P_{\psi_k}$, and so $P_k\Pi_\psi = P_{\psi_k}$. This proves (5.36).

The relation (5.37) is an immediate consequence of the fact just demonstrated that for all ψ, $P_{\psi_k} \leq P_k$. Finally we have $\left(\sum_k P_k\right)\Pi_\varphi = \Pi_\varphi$ and so $\Pi_\varphi \leq \sum_k P_k$. Since all $P_{\psi_k} \leq \Pi_\psi$, the converse ordering holds as well. This proves (5.38).

The maps T_k are clearly linear and positive. We have $T_k(P_\xi) = P_k\Pi_\xi = P_{\xi_k}$ for all vectors $\xi \neq 0$, so the T_k are trace preserving and thus pure stochastic maps. Let $\psi, \xi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$, with $\psi \perp \xi$. Then $\Pi_\psi \perp \Pi_\xi$ [since T is orthogonality preserving], and so $P_{\psi_k} \perp P_{\xi_k}$, that is, $T_k(P_\psi) \perp T_k(P_\xi)$. Thus the T_k are orthogonality preserving and therefore (pure stochastic) isometries. Eq. (5.39) then follows by straightforward application of (5.40). The existence of unitary or antiunitary maps U_k satisfying (5.41) is a consequence of Theorem 2.3.1 of [5] [cf. Proposition 3.1 above].

If U_k is unitary, we find, using $U_k^*U_k = I$:

$$T_k(P_\varphi)T_k(P_\vartheta)T_k(P_\psi)T_k(P_\varphi) \;=\; U_k(P_\varphi P_\vartheta P_\psi P_\varphi)\,U_k^* \;=\; a^\varphi_{\vartheta\psi}\, T_k(P_\varphi).$$

Similarly, if U_k is antiunitary, we find:

$$T_k(P_\varphi)T_k(P_\vartheta)T_k(P_\psi)T_k(P_\varphi) \;=\; U_k(P_\varphi P_\vartheta P_\psi P_\varphi)\,U_k^* \;=\; \overline{a^\varphi_{\vartheta\psi}}\, T_k(P_\varphi).$$

Observing that $T_k(P_\xi) \perp T_\ell(P_\chi)$ $(k \neq \ell)$ and $\Pi_\varphi = \sum T_k(P_\varphi)$, etc., we obtain:

$$\mathcal{W}^\varphi_{\vartheta\psi} \;=\; \Pi_\varphi\Pi_\vartheta\Pi_\psi\Pi_\varphi \;=\; \sum_k T_k(P_\varphi)T_k(P_\vartheta)T_k(P_\psi)T_k(P_\varphi) \;=\; \sum_k a_k T_k(P_\varphi),$$

where $a_k = a^\varphi_{\vartheta\psi}$ or $a_k = \overline{a^\varphi_{\vartheta\psi}}$ according to whether U_k is unitary or antiunitary. Comparing this with Eqs. (5.31),(5.32), it is seen that all the U_k must either be simultaneously unitary or antiunitary in order to reproduce the right hand sides of these equations.

From $T_k(P_\varphi) \cdot T_\ell(P_\psi) = 0$ for $k \neq \ell$, $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}\backslash\{0\}$, it follows that $U_k^*U_\ell = \delta_{k\ell}I_{\mathcal{H}}$. Also, it is obvious that the projection $U_kU_k^*$ has the same range as P_k, and so $U_kU_k^* = P_k$. □

Remark 5.1. The stochastic isometries $T^{(L)}$, $T^{(A)}$ of Proposition 5.3, Eq. (5.30), are convex combinations of pure stochastic isometries generated by linear and antilinear isometries of $\mathcal{H}$, respectively. This explains the use of the superscripts $(L), (A)$ throughout this section.

Proofs of Proposition 3.4 and Theorem 1. Proposition 3.4 is a direct consequence of the combination of Propositions 5.3 and 5.4. Theorem 1 is a direct result of the combination of Propositions 3.3 and 3.4. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $T = \sum_k w_k T_k$ be a stochastic isometry of the form of Eq. (3.2), the T_k being pure stochastic isometries generated by unitary or antiunitary maps $U_k : \mathcal{H} \to \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k$. For U_k unitary (antiunitary), T_k is completely positive (not completely positive). The sum of completely positive maps is completely positive, and this extends to σ-convex combinations. Hence T is completely positive whenever all U_k are unitary.

Conversely, let T be completely positive. Suppose some U_k is antiunitary. Hence there exist unit vectors $\Psi \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$, $\Theta \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\langle\, \Psi \,|\, T \otimes \imath(P_\Theta)\Psi \,\rangle = \langle\, \Psi \,|\, T_k \otimes \imath(P_\Theta)\Psi \,\rangle < 0. \tag{5.42}$$

(Here $\imath$ denotes the identity map on $\mathcal{H}_1(\mathbb{C}^n)$.) The equality is due to the choice of Ψ in the subspace $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k \otimes \mathbb{C}^n$ and the fact that the ranges of the U_ℓ are mutually orthogonal. Eq. (5.42) contradicts the complete positivity of T. □

6. Concluding Remarks. Some Physical Applications

Stochastic isometries give rise to a variety of associated maps some of which will be briefly described here. Any linear bounded map $T : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s \to \mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})_s$ has a unique extension to a linear bounded map on $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$. This extension of T will be denoted $\widehat{T}$. A stochastic map T has a unique extension to a linear, trace preserving map on $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$.

The extension $\widehat{T}$ to $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ of a pure stochastic isometry T generated by a unitary or antiunitary map $U : \mathcal{H} \to \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ is given as follows: for $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{T}(\rho) &= U\rho U^* \quad \text{if } U \text{ is unitary;} \\ \widehat{T}(\rho) &= U\rho^* U^* \quad \text{if } U \text{ is antiunitary.} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6.1. *The extension* $\widehat{T}$:$\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$ *of a stochastic isometry* $T : \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s \to \mathcal{B}_1(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})_s$ *is a trace preserving isometry. Conversely, the restriction to* $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s$ *of a trace preserving isometry on* $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$ *is a stochastic isometry.*

Proof. Let T be a stochastic isometry, $\widehat{T}$ its extension. That $\widehat{T}$ is trace preserving follows trivially from the corresponding property or T. Using Eq. (3.2), one finds $|T(\rho)| = \sum_k w_k \big|U_k \rho U_k^*\big|$ for $\rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$, and so

$$\big\|\widehat{T}(\rho)\big\|_1 \;=\; \mathrm{tr}\big[\,|T(\rho)|\,\big] \;=\; \sum_k w_k\, \|\rho\|_1 \;=\; \|\rho\|_1 \,.$$

Conversely, assume $\widehat{T}$ is a trace preserving isometry on $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$, and let T denote its restriction to $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s$. T is clearly trace preserving and isometric and therefore, by Lemma 2.1, a stochastic isometry. □

Proposition 6.2. *Let* $T = \sum_k w_k T_k : V \to \tilde{V}$ *be a stochastic isometry, with* T_k *pure stochastic isometries as in Eq. (3.2). Then*

$$\tilde{T}(\tau) \;:=\; \sum_k \sqrt{w_k}\, T_k(\tau), \quad \tau \in \mathcal{B}_2(\mathcal{H}),$$

defines an isometry $\tilde{T}$ *of the Hilbert Schmidt class* $\mathcal{B}_2(\mathcal{H})$*.*

Proof. For $\tau \in \mathcal{B}_2(\mathcal{H})$, one easily verifies that

$$\tilde{T}(\tau)^*\tilde{T}(\tau) \;=\; \sum_k w_k T_k(\tau)^* T_k(\tau) \;\in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$$

(where we used the orthogonality $T_k(\tau)^* T_\ell(\tau) = 0$, $k \neq \ell$), and so

$$\big\|R(\tau)\big\|_2^2 \;=\; \sum_k w_k \mathrm{tr}\big[U_k \tau^* \tau\, U_k^*\big] \;=\; \big\|\tau\big\|_2^2.$$

Therefore, $\|R(\tau)\|_2 = \|\tau\|_2$. □

Remark 6.1. Let $T = \sum_k w_k T_k$ be a stochastic isometry, with pure stochastic isometric components T_k, $\widehat{T} = \sum_k w_k \widehat{T_k}$ its extension to $\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})$. It follows that ${}^oT := \sum_k \widehat{T_k}$ is an isometry on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and a Jordan $*$-isomorphism, and that its restriction to the orthocomplemented lattice of projections of $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, is a lattice- and ortho-isomorphism from $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ onto the lattice

$$\mathcal{P}_T := \left\{\Pi\left(T(\rho)\right) \,:\, \rho \in \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s\right\}.$$

The map ${}^oT$ decomposes in a unique way into

$$\begin{aligned} {}^oT &= {}^oT^{(L)} + {}^oT^{(A)}, \\ {}^oT^{(L)}(a) &= P^{(L)}\, {}^oT(a)\, P^{(L)}, \quad {}^oT^{(A)}(a) \;=\; P^{(A)}\, {}^oT(a)\, P^{(A)}, \quad a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \end{aligned}$$

and ${}^oT^{(L)}$ $[{}^oT^{(A)}]$ is a $*$-isomorphism [$*$-anti-isomorphism] of the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ onto the subalgebras ${}^oT^{(L)}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$ $[{}^oT^{(A)}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))]$. This is an illustration of the result of Kadison [8] cited in Section 1.

Further we note that the projections $P^{(L)}, P^{(A)}$ are in the centre of the von Neumann algebra generated by ${}^oT\,(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$. In physical terms, they induce a superselection rule on the state space $T(\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})_s)$.

Remark 6.2. Consider a completely positive m-mixing stochastic isometry, $T = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{k=1}^m T_k$, with $T_k(\rho) = U_k \rho U_k^*$, all U_k unitary (hence $m^{(L)} = m$). The maps U_k are not uniquely determined by T, even apart from a phase factor, if $m \geq 2$. This is apparent from the construction of the pure isometries T_k in Proposition 5.4, which was based on the choice of some nonzero vector $\varphi^0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and an arbitrary ONB φ_k of $\Pi_{\varphi^0}\mathcal{H}$. Accordingly, it can be shown that if $T(\rho) = \frac{1}{m}\sum_k U_k \rho U_k^* = \frac{1}{m}\sum_k V_k \rho V_k^*$, where V_k is another set of unitary maps, then

$$V_k \;=\; \sum_\ell \gamma_{k\ell}\, U_\ell,$$

with $(\gamma_{k\ell})$ a unitary $m \times m$ matrix. It is easily verified that this condition ensures that the V_k define the same mixing stochastic isometry as the U_k.

The totality of all projections $Q_k = V_k V_k^*$ thus obtained from a given set U_k using all unitary matrices $(\gamma_{k\ell})$ commute with all elements of $T\left(\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{H})\right)$ and ${}^oT\left(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\right)$.

Remark 6.3. The relation $\Pi_\varphi \Pi_\psi \Pi_\varphi = \alpha \Pi_\varphi$, valid for m-mixing stochastic isometries shows that the set of projections Π_φ bears some fundamental similarities with the set of one dimensional projections. In fact pairs of projections satisfying such a relation (with nonzero factor α) are called *isoclinic*; their geometric significance has been studied by von Neumann [9]. Note that also the projections P_k, Q_ℓ discussed in Remark 6.2 are isoclinic.

A physically interesting feature of a stochastic isometry T lies in the fact that its inverse on the range $T(V)$ can be extended to a stochastic map on V.

Theorem 3. *Let $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ be a stochastic isometry. The inverse $T^{-1} : T(V) \to V$ admits an extension to a stochastic map on $\tilde{V}$ as follows. For T expressed in the form of Eq. (3.2), let P_0 be the projection onto $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0$. The following defines a stochastic map on $\tilde{V}$:*

$$S(\rho) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} U_k^* \rho\, U_k \,+\, P_0 \rho P_0, \quad \rho \in \tilde{V}.$$

Then $T^{-1} = S|_{T(V)}$.

Proof. The positivity of S is obvious. Trace preservation follows from the fact that $U_k U_k^* = P_k$ is the projection onto $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{N} P_k = I_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}$.

Let $\rho = T(\sigma)$. Then, since $U_k^* U_\ell = \delta_{k\ell} I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $P_0\, \rho\, P_0 = 0$, one has

$$S(\rho) = S\left(T(\sigma)\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} w_k U_\ell^* U_k\, \sigma\, U_k^* U_\ell = \sum_{k=1}^{N} w_k \sigma = \sigma = T^{-1}\left(\rho\right).$$

Hence $S|_{T(V)} = T^{-1}$. □

This result suggests the possibility that reversible physical state changes are not necessarily represented by surjective, and hence pure, stochastic isometries, but that a state change effected by *any* stochastic isometry is reversible: there exists a single dynamical map that sends all final states back to the initial states. This interpretation is further elaborated in [3].

Pursuing further the dynamical interpretation of stochastic isometries, it may be observed that such maps induce a reduction of the symmetries of the physical system in question. In this sense it can be said that dynamical maps represented as stochastic isometries describe the formation of *structure* (in a reversible way). According to a theorem due to Wigner, any symmetry operation [1], defined as an angle preserving map of the set of rays of $\mathcal{H}$ onto itself, is induced by a unitary or antiunitary map according to Eq. (3.1). For simplicity, we consider a completely positive stochastic isometry of the form

(3.2), with all U_k unitary. Let U be a unitary symmetry operation. Then we compute:

$$T\,(U\rho U^*) \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{N} w_k\,(U_k U U_k^*)\; U_k\rho\, U_k^*\;(U_k U^* U_k^*) \;=\; \tilde{U}\,T(\rho)\,\tilde{U}^*,$$

where

$$\tilde{U} \;=\; \sum_k U_k U\, U_k^* \;=\; {}^oT(U)$$

is unitary. The map $U \longmapsto \tilde{U}$ is injective. But to every U there do exist unitary maps $V \neq \tilde{U}$ such that

$$\tilde{U}\,T(\rho)\,\tilde{U}^* = V\,T(\rho)\,V^* \tag{6.1}$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{H})$. In fact, define a unitary map $W = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \lambda_k P_k$, with $P_k = U_k U_k^*$, $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\lambda_k| = 1$, such that $W \neq I$. Let $V = \tilde{U}W$. Then (6.1) holds due to the fact that W commutes with all $T(\rho)$. This shows that on the state space $T\,(\mathcal{H}_1(\mathcal{H})_s)$ not all symmetries of $\mathcal{H}$ can be distinguished.

There is another interpretation of a stochastic isometry T and its associated map ${}^oT$ defined in Remark 6.1. These maps lead to a physically equivalent description of all states and observables of the given quantum system in the following sense: for all states ρ and effects a, the corresponding states $T(\rho)$ and effects ${}^oT(a)$ give the same probabilities:

$$\langle T(\rho)\,,\, {}^oT(a)\rangle \;=\; \langle \rho\,,\, a\rangle.$$

This observation can be elaborated into a general theory of extensions of the statistical description of a quantum physical system on the basis of Theorem 1[2].

Appendix A. Algebraic Proof of Proposition 3.4

The decomposition of a mixing stochastic isometry into pure stochastic isometries can be obtained by application of Kadison's work on isometries of operator algebras [8], thereby bypassing the explicit geometric constructions of Section 5. Here we sketch the required steps.

Let $T : V \to \tilde{V}$ be an m-mixing stochastic isometry. One first shows that the map ${}^oT : V \to \tilde{V}$, ${}^oT = m\,T$ extends to a linear, $*$-preserving, norm-bounded map ${}^o\widehat{T}{:}\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\mathcal{H}})$. This map sends projections to projections and is σ-ortho-additive on the set of projections.

Following an argument of Wright [10], ${}^o\widehat{T}$ is finally shown to be a Jordan $*$-homomorpism.

The decomposition of ${}^o\widehat{T}$, and hence of T, is then obtained by application of the arguments of Wright [10], which make use of Kadison's theorem on isometries [8] in the form presented by Emch ([6], Theorem 1, p. 153).

References

[1] V. Bargmann, *Notes on Wigner's theorem on symmetry operations* J. Math. Phys., vol. 5 (1964), pp. 862–868.

[2] P. Busch, *Quantum extensions of quantum statistical models*, Preprint (1998).

[3] P. Busch, R. Quadt, *Operational characterization of irreversibility*, Report Series, Department of Mathematics, University of Hull (1998).

[4] G. Cassinelli, E. DeVito, P. J. Lahti, A. Levrero, *Symmetry groups in quantum mechanics and the theorem of Wigner on the symmetry transformations*, Rev. Math. Phys., vol. 9 (1997), pp. 921–941.

[5] E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*, Academic Press, New York, 1976.

[6] G. G. Emch, *Algebraic Methods in Statistical Mechanics and Quantum Field Theory*, Wiley, New York, 1972.

[7] R. V. Kadison, *Transformations of states in operator theory and dynamics*, Topology, vol. 3 (Suppl. 2) (1965), pp. 177–198.

[8] R. V. Kadison, *Isometries of operator algebras*, Ann. of Math., vol. 54 (1951), pp. 325–338.

[9] S. Maeda,*Probability measures on projectors in von Neumann algebras*, Rev. Math. Phys., vol. 1 (1990), pp. 235–290.

[10] R. Wright, *The structure of projection-valued states: a generalization of Wigner's theorem*, Int. J. Theor. Phys., vol. 16 (1977), pp. 567–573.